

Amendments to the Drawings:

Enclosed with this Amendment and Response are six sheets (1/6 to 6/6) of proposed substitute drawings containing Figs. 1-18. New Figs. 1-18 are being submitted herewith in response to the Examiner's objection to the legibility of the originally-filed drawings in the last Office Action. Please substitute these new sheets of drawings for original sheets 1/6 to 6/6 of the drawings.

Except for the correction of a few minor and obvious reference numeral errors (as noted below), each of new Figs. 1-18 is substantially identical to Figs. 1-18 as originally filed. The drawing changes (corrections) are as follows:

Fig. 2 – The plate 1 (as seen in Fig. 1) was incorrectly labelled as reference numeral “5” on original Fig. 1. This error has been corrected on newly-submitted Fig. 1. Support for this correction is found in the description of this Figure at page 14, lines 26-32 of the Specification.

Fig. 11 – Newly-submitted Fig. 11 has added a missing lead line from the reference numeral “72a” to the lock nut. New Fig. 11 also corrects the mislabelling of the screw head (incorrectly labelled by reference numeral “72” on original Fig. 11) to reference numeral “74.” Support for these corrections is found in the description of this Figure at page 16, lines 9-19 of the Specification.

Fig. 12 – Newly-submitted Fig. 12 has modified the lead line from reference numeral “90” to the bar identified by that reference numeral by only extending the line to the exterior of the bar. Also, the reference numeral “68” has been added to identify the scale (as also seen in Fig. 11). Support for these corrections is found in the description of this Figure at page 16, line 27 to page 17, line 12 of the Specification.

REMARKS

A. Status of the Claims

In the Office Action of September 10, 2007:

Claims 1-45 were previously canceled.

Claims 46-61, 63, 65, 67 and 69 were rejected.

Claims 62, 64, 66 and 68 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions.

In the present Amendment and Response: (1) Claims 46, 48, 55-59 and 67 have been amended; (2) Claims 47, 49-54, 60-66, 68 and 69 have been canceled; and (3) new Claims 70-76 have been added. New Claims 70, 73 and 74 are dependent claims directed to the invention embodiment in which the "second part" is selected from one of a plurality of interchangeable parts, as described in the application. New Claim 72 is a dependent claim directed to the invention embodiment in which the plenum chamber fibres have a particular orientation relative to the rest of the apparatus, as described in the application. New Claim 75 is a dependent claim based in part on canceled Claim 64; and, new Claim 76 is a dependent claim based in part on canceled Claim 66.

No new matter has been added. Each of the claim amendments and the new claims is clearly supported by the original disclosure. Because the claim amendments are numerous and, it is believed, are clearly supported by the original disclosure, Applicant will not endeavor to identify for each such amendment where in the original disclosure such support may be found. However, upon request by the Examiner, Applicant agrees to promptly identify the support for any particular claim language.

B. The Drawing Objection

The Examiner objected to the drawings “due to poor legibility (shading)” and required the submission of new drawings. In response, Applicant is submitting herewith six new sheets of drawings (1/6 to 6/6) containing the same Figs. 1-18, but with clearer/more legible lines and shadings. As discussed above, a few minor and obvious drawing errors in the original drawings have been corrected in the new drawings, but no new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully requests that the new sheets of drawings 1/6 to 6/6 submitted herewith be substituted for the corresponding original sheets of drawings 1/6 to 6/6.

C. Specification/Abstract

The Examiner also objected to the Abstract on various grounds. In response, Applicant is canceling the Abstract as filed and substituting therefor a new, shorter Abstract that is free of the objectionable “legal phraseology.” Applicant respectfully submits that the new Abstract obviates this objection.

D. Claim Objections

The Examiner also objected to the misspelling of “router” in Claim 46. In the amended claims submitted herewith, the spelling of “router” in Claim 46 has been corrected.

E. Sec. 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 47, 49-57, 61, 63, 65 and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in various respects.

Of these rejected claims, Claims 47, 49-54, 61, 63, 65 and 69 have been canceled and, therefore, will not be further discussed. Claims 55, 56 and 57 have herein been amended to overcome the Sec. 112 indefiniteness rejection.

It appears that the inclusion of Claims 55, 56 and 57 in this §112 indefiniteness rejection was based solely on the fact that these claims were dependent on Claim 50, which was the subject of several specific §112 grounds of objection. In this Amendment and Response, Claims 55, 56 and 57 have been made dependent on Claim 46 instead of Claim 50. In addition, other amendments have been made to Claims 55, 56 and 57 to improve the clarity of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 55, 56 and 57, as amended, obviate the §112 indefiniteness rejection.

F. Sec. 102 Claim Rejection

Claims 46-48 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,998,897 (Bosten '897). Applicant respectfully requests that this ground of rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims and the following Remarks.

Independent Claim 46 has been amended to further clarify and to better define the present invention. These clarifying amendments are also believed to better distinguish this claim over the apparatus shown and described in Bosten '897. In particular, it should be noted that Claim 46 now more clearly recites the plug-and-socket arrangement for a router in accordance with this invention, as described for

example at page 4, lines 14-18 of the Specification. The adaptation of such a plug-and-socket arrangement to a router apparatus, and the unexpected benefits resulting from such an arrangement, are considered novel aspects of the present invention. No comparable plug-and-socket arrangement is taught or suggested by Bosten '897.

In the rejection, the Examiner specifically referenced Fig. 6A of Bosten '897, arguing that this figure shows an "attachment comprising a base plate (fig. 6A) for the router having two separable parts (1,2)..." However, apart from the "Brief Description of the Drawings" in Bosten '897 (which describes Fig. 6A as "an exploded view of the components of a router according to an example embodiment of the present invention"), no further description of Fig. 6A appears anywhere in Bosten '897. Nevertheless, the Examiner has copied a portion of Fig. 6A in the Office Action and has labeled certain components based on the Examiner's own interpretation of those components – for example, the component that the Examiner has labeled as a "Guide" bears no reference numeral and is nowhere described in Bosten '897. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner explain the basis for labeling the components of Fig. 6A of Bosten '897 in the Office Action.

Another portion of Bosten '897 that might be considered relevant to this invention, although not referenced in the Office Action, is the description appearing at col. 15, line 30 to col. 16, line 31, including what seems to be a partial description of Fig. 14. Although Fig. 14 of Bosten '897 may appear to show a separable base portion of the router apparatus, it is not clear that such a construction would serve any advantageous purpose because the two parts are peripherally coterminous, even to the position of the "straight edge" (which seems to be identified at col. 16, line 16 of Bosten '897 by reference numeral "1403," even though such a reference numeral does

not appear in Fig. 14 or any other figure). In any event, in the configuration shown in Fig. 14 of Bosten '897, even if it is interpreted as showing two separable parts, it would be the lower member that may plug into the upper member, not the other way around.

By contrast, the base plug and socket arrangement (as now recited in Claim 46) confers the important advantage that the first and second parts of the claimed apparatus may have co-planar working surfaces. As a result of this claimed configuration, the second part could be fitted to the apparatus of this invention during a routing procedure without having to adjust the cutter depth. Such an advantage was unforeseen in Bosten '897 and cannot be realized with the apparatus as shown and described in Bosten '897.

Moreover, still another advantage of the present invention relative to the apparatus of Bosten '897 is that the present invention permits a set of different base second parts to be interchangeable on the first part. One or some of those different base second parts may advantageously incorporate guide rails carrying a guide edge (as recited in Claims 48 and 56). Alternatively or additionally, one of those different base second parts can be a broad sheet acting as a workpiece support surface through which the router can protrude upwards (as recited in Claim 55).

Bosten '897 does not teach or suggest such router embodiments; and, indeed, it is not clear how the Bosten '897 apparatus could be adapted to accommodate these embodiments. The Bosten '897 apparatus appears to rely upon the straight edge of one or both of the base members (possibly in order to operate against an external edge portion that is not shown or described), but this apparatus configuration does not lend

itself to the router modifications and function customization realized with the present invention.

In addition, Bosten '897 does not teach or suggest the "plenum chamber" as recited in Claims 57-59 of this invention (and Claim 72 which is dependent on Claim 59).

Accordingly, the rejection of the subject claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Bosten '897 reference should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 46, 48, 55-59, 67 and 70-76 now pending in this application are in condition for allowance, and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date January 9, 2008

Andover-IP-Law
44 Park Street, Suite 300
Andover, MA 01810
Telephone: (978) 470-0990
Facsimile: (978) 470-0993

David Silverstein
Registration Number 26,336
Attorney for Applicant